

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Jung (US 2003/0066452). Claims 4 and 11 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jung in view of Rodi (US 5,115,741). Claim 6 to 8 were objected to but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 9 and 16 have been amended.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 to 8 were objected to but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form

Withdrawal of the objections to claim 6 and its dependent claims 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Jung (US 2003/0066452).

Jung teaches the application of a catalyst mixture via an applicator roll 12 either downstream of a printing nip where printing ink containing inhibitors and oligomers is transferred onto the printing material (see Figures 1 and 2) or together with the printing ink via the inking unit (see paragraph [0034]).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein the applying of the treatment agent at the second position occurs before the printing at the first position,” as described for example in Fig. 1 and [0044].

Jung does not teach this limitation.

Claim 9 now recites a printing press wherein the drying device includes at least one narrow-band radiant energy source emitting light of one wavelength in the near infrared region, a limitation found in rejected claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that Jung does not show this feature. See also Office Action section 5 and allowance of claim 6.

In view of the above the rejection to claims 1 to 3, 5, 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections


Claims 4 and 11 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jung in view of Rodi (US 5,115,741).

In view of the comments above with respect to the independent claims, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 4 and 11 to 16 is respectfully requested as well.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940